

## REMARKS

The Examiner has indicated that pending claims 1-15 are drawn to different inventions, which are:

Group 1, containing claims 1-9, drawn to a method; and  
Group 2, containing claims 10-15, drawn to a system.

Applicant hereby elects Group 2.

Applicant notes that Douglas (U.S.P.N. 7,686,403) has been cited to support the restriction requirement. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's acknowledgment in a telephonic discussion that Douglas is not prior art to the pending application. Applicant notes that according to the Examiner, the teaching of Douglas, of checking tire balance, is common knowledge.

Applicant respectfully asserts that tire balancing, as cited by the Examiner, is merely the identification of the known unbalancing problem and not the presently claimed solution. Applicant respectfully asserts that hindsight is required to find that the application of wheel balancing according to the claimed method and system is commonly known.

Respectfully submitted,  
Day Pitney, LLP

By /T. David Bomzer Reg. 48770/  
T. David Bomzer  
Reg. No. 48,770  
Attorney for Applicants

Day Pitney, LLP  
7 Times Square  
New York, NY 10063